



MINNESOTA BOARD OF TEACHING

***INSTITUTIONAL AND
TEACHER EDUCATION
PROGRAM EVALUATION***

***PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOL
FOR CONDUCTING A CONCURRENT
BOARD OF TEACHING/NCATE VISIT***

***Minnesota Board of Teaching
2011***

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	PAGE 3
BACKGROUND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minnesota Board of Teaching Rules 8700.7600 • New 8700.7600 – Adopted May 2000 • Need and Reasonableness 	PAGE 3
ON-SITE EVALUATION VISIT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selecting a Date • Preparing the Institutional Report (IR) • Program Approval 	PAGE 6
INSTITUTIONAL REPORT	PAGE 8
EVALUATION TEAM RESPONSIBILITIES	PAGE 10
CAMPUS WORKROOM	PAGE 11
PRE-VISIT	PAGE 14
TIMELINE FOR THE ON-SITE VISIT	PAGE 19
APPENDIX A – STATUTORY LANGUAGE	PAGE 21
APPENDIX B – NCATE/BOT PARTNERSHIP PROTOCOL	PAGE 24
APPENDIX C – BOARD OF TEACHING RULE 8700.7600, SUBPART 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards, Examples of Sources of Evidence, Persons to Interview, Examples of Team Questions 	PAGE 40
APPENDIX D – EXAMPLES OF EXHIBITS FOR SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION	PAGE 55
APPENDIX E – SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	PAGE 57
APPENDIX F- PROGRAMS GRANTED NATIONAL RECOGNITION from SPAs	PAGE 61
APPENDIX G – OPERATING PROCEDURES	PAGE 62
APPENDIX H – EXAMPLE DOCUMENT LISTING	PAGE 65

CONCURRENT STATE/NCATE EVALUATION VISIT

Since 1979 the Minnesota Board of Teaching has applied institutional approval standards in making a decision regarding institutional capacity to offer teacher education programs. Furthermore, to assist colleges/universities that might seek national accreditation, the Board of Teaching has aligned the schedule of state institutional approval visits with the visits by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). As of September 1994, a formal relationship between the state of Minnesota and NCATE was entered through the *Minnesota/NCATE Partnership Agreement* and must be renewed every five years.

NCATE/State-based Standards Framework

*NCATE unit standards are applied and NCATE relies on the state to review the individual teacher education programs. * In these partnerships, the state program standards correlate closely with NCATE's program standards developed by the specialized professional associations (SPAs - National Association of Educators of Young Children, Association of Childhood Education International, National Council for Teachers of Mathematics, National Association of School Psychologists, etc.) that belong to NCATE.*

NCATE has also determined that the state's process for reviewing the programs is rigorous and effective.

***NOTE: In Minnesota, Institutional Standards (Board Rule 8700.7600) are applied.**

See Appendix E for list of state programs granted national recognition.

In accordance with guidelines of the Minnesota/NCATE partnership to operate a concurrent evaluation visit that is comprehensive and compatible rather than duplicative, the Minnesota Board of Teaching will continue to provide institutions with the option of conducting concurrent evaluation visits. During a concurrent evaluation visit the Board of Teaching rules continue to be applied under the partnership (Board of Teaching Rule, part 8700.7600). The specifics for conducting a Concurrent Minnesota/NCATE Evaluation Visit are outlined in the jointly prepared *PROTOCOL: Current NCATE/STATE Visits in Minnesota*. (See **APPENDIX A**).

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

The Board of Teaching grants licenses to teach to applicants who have completed approved teacher preparation programs (sets of courses or learning experiences leading to qualifying for separate teacher licensure fields such as elementary education, mathematics, art, etc.). Before Minnesota teacher preparation programs within higher education institutions can be approved, the institutions themselves must be approved. Board of Teaching Rules Part 8700.7600, was adopted in May 2000, and was intended to codify and communicate standards institutions must demonstrate to ensure that candidates enrolled in these approved institutions have the opportunity to learn and demonstrate the knowledge and skills required for teacher licensure.

Thirty-two Minnesota colleges/universities currently have Board of Teaching approval to prepare candidates for state licensure. These institutions, both private, public, and for profit, undergo periodic institutional review for renewal approval. Since 1979 institutional review procedures have required that Minnesota institutions prepare and submit a written self-study responding to a set of standards adopted by the Board of Teaching in Minnesota Rules Part 8700.7600.

The **Minnesota Board of Teaching Rules 8700.7600; Minnesota Institutional and Program Approval** were revised in May 2000. Previously, 8700.7600 contained twenty-four standards that focused on: *institutional commitment, organization and administration of programs, institutional student services, faculty, professional education component, physical facilities, media resources, and program evaluation*. In addition, the Board of Teaching adopted Minnesota Rules, part 8700.7710, Teacher Education Program Evaluation in 1990. These standards took effective July 1, 1995, and required institutions to begin redesigning teacher

preparation programs to demonstrate compliance with: *outcomes, knowledge base, liberal arts, clinical and field experiences, formal partnerships, student evaluation, demonstration of outcomes, effective teaching, and program evaluation*. The twenty-four standards identified in 8700.7600, along with standards in 8700.7710 were combined and revised to compose new Minnesota Rules, part 8700.7600.

New Board of Teaching Rule, part 8700.7600 standards stems from the following:

- The need for congruence in a standards-based system which requires that students, teachers, and preparation institutions be evaluated based on articulated standards.
- The need to articulate for and with the colleges of teacher education the criteria on which the institution and their programs will be approved.
- The need to revise the existing Board of Teaching Rule 8700.7600 was expressed by the Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The Board of Teaching elicited input and advice from the Association (MACTE).

The Board of Teaching elicited input and advice from MACTE to develop the new rules for approval of Minnesota institutions. Representatives identified by MACTE worked with staff in the Department of Children, Families and Learning during the 1999 year to develop a draft of the standards for institutional approval. The draft was circulated by the leadership of MACTE to its members to elicit comments and feedback.

The reasonableness of the adopted 8700.7600 rules rests in four areas of analysis:

1. A system of quality assurance is reasonable in that it provides assurance that a college/university has itself achieved a set of standards that assess the institution's capacity to offer programs leading to teacher licensure;

2. The new rules are based on and are consistent with already-adopted rules (8700.7700, Subparts 1-11) that have been determined reasonable in recent rule making actions. The rules for licensure program approval align with program standards adopted by the Board of Teaching in March 1999. These rules further provide verification that a candidate has successfully completed an approved program and can demonstrate effectiveness that is consistent with required knowledge and skills for teacher licensure stated in Minnesota Rule Chapter 8710;
3. Rules adopted in May 2000, 8700.7600, require institutions to demonstrate how institutions have responded to standards in the redesign effort of teacher preparation that require programs to be results-oriented, programmatically coherent, research supported, and clinically focused.

AUTHORIZATION: Adopted Permanent Rules Relating to Institution and Teacher Preparation Program Approval 8700.7600

Subpart 1. **In general.** Licenses to teach in Minnesota may be granted to persons who complete Approved programs leading to teacher licensure in Minnesota institutions approved by the Board of Teaching to prepare persons for teacher licensure according to this part.

Subpart 2a. **Definitions.** For the purpose of this part, the terms in this subpart have the meanings given

- A. "Teacher preparation program" means a college or university program, approved by the Board of Teaching for the purpose of preparing individuals for a specific teacher licensure field in Minnesota.
- B. "Unit" means an institution or a defined subdivision of the institution, for example a college, department, or division that has primary responsibility for overseeing teacher preparation programs.

Subpart 3. **Evaluation of institutions and programs.** Each Minnesota institution granting baccalaureate degrees, post baccalaureate degrees, or both, requesting approval to prepare persons for teacher licensure shall be evaluated for both institutional and program approval according to this part.

Subpart 4. **Duration of approval.** The Board of Teaching may approve an institution or a teacher preparation program for a period of up to seven years. At least one year prior to the expiration of the approval period, the institution or preparation program shall submit a request to the Board of Teaching for continuing approval and shall be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of this part.

Subpart 5. **Written application required.** A written application for approval of an institution must demonstrate: (See **APPENDIX B** for a complete listing of the eight categories and 53 standards).

PREPARING FOR A NCATE/BOT ON-SITE EVALUATION VISIT

Every Minnesota post-secondary institution seeking approval to prepare candidates for teacher licensure must demonstrate compliance with Minnesota Rules, part 8700.7600. To determine approval status: Initial Approval, Continuing Approval, Approval with Conditions, or Disapproval, each institution must undergo an on-site review every 4-7 years during which a team verifies the accuracy of a written self-study report. When requested by the institution, the State will coordinate the State evaluation visit to occur concurrently with the national accreditation visit.

Selecting a Date for the Review

National accrediting groups typically request the unit to submit its preferred visit dates at **least one year prior** to the anticipated on-site review. After you have identified a couple of date ranges, contact the Board of Teaching (BOT) to verify that the proposed dates are available for the Board Team. Once the unit and the Board of Teaching have agreed on the possible dates, you will then submit the selected date(s) to NCATE for their acceptance.

This procedure should also be used in setting the date of the **pre-visit**. First, identify possible dates for the pre-visit and offer them to the BOT and NCATE chairs for acceptance.

In preparation for the visit the institution must prepare an Institutional Report (self-study) responding to each of the state institutional standards. The institution must make certain that the Institutional Report addresses each Minnesota standard specifically and that BOT standards are linked to evidence in the report. This quite often requires a cross reference/index of NCATE standards to BOT standards and to the evidence provided for each

standard. **Note:** The BOT team members must be able to clearly and quickly locate the section of the report that addresses Minnesota standards, as they may or may not be familiar with NCATE standards and the alignment between standards. Institutional reports must be electronic and contain links to the evidence that supports each standard. This enables teams to access critical information about the institution even before arriving on site for the visit.

Review of Individual Programs

Beginning in September 2000, the review of individual teacher licensure programs occurs as follows: Board of Teaching Rule 8700.7600, Subpart 6. **Evaluation procedures for institutions and programs.** Applications submitted for institutional and program approval shall be evaluated as follows:

Two or more program evaluators shall be assigned by the Board of Teaching to examine, evaluate, and make recommendations based on the information submitted by the institution for each of the institution's teacher preparation programs. Program evaluators shall include individuals with both licensure level and post-secondary experience and expertise in the licensure field of the program being evaluated.

Individual licensure programs are submitted separately and directly to the staff of the Board of Teaching for dissemination to qualified reviewers. Individual programs are not reviewed by on-site team members during the visit. However, copies of the Professional Education Program Evaluation Reports (PEPER) must be available for team reference either via links within the electronic institutional report or available in the exhibit room. In accordance with the Minnesota/NCATE Protocol, NCATE folio submission is not required in Minnesota.

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

Some institutions have merged the NCATE and BOT self study reports and others find it more convenient to separate them. Either way, it is the responsibility of the institution, either through the report design and/or supplemental documentation, to ensure that the institution is in compliance with all Board of Teaching Standards 8700.7600, subpart 5 A-

H. <http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/arule/8700/7600.html>. It is still necessary for each BOT standard to be linked to compliance statement and collaborating evidence as part of the (shared or separate) institutional report.

While the institution determines the actual format of the report (using the NCATE guidelines if desired) it is suggested (for BOT purposes) that a preface or introductory section providing a brief historical and/or geographical profile of the institution be included. This section is the institution's opportunity to set the context of the visit for the visiting team. It should also provide the review team with an understanding of changes, developments, activities at the campus and state level which might influence the mission, directions and delivery of teacher education programs on campus and allows you to address any changes since the last visit.

The institution should also describe the foundational and conceptual framework that guides the development, implementation, and evaluation of the unit's programs.

1. The college/department should address each standard in the written report and should discuss the types of evidence that it available to demonstrate that it is meeting each standard. Some standards are multifaceted and the institution should give attention to each aspect of the standard.
 - Standards must be supported by related evidence and when possible, hyper links should be provided within the narrative. See appendix C for an example.
 - A comprehensive listing of all supporting documentation should be provided, arranged by Board standard. This listing is used by team members as a checklist to assure that all evidence is reviewed while on-site.
 - A draft copy of the Institutional Report should be sent to the chair a week prior to the pre-visit.

- The final institutional report should be made available for all team members approximately four (4) weeks before the on-site visit.

BOARD OF TEACHING (BOT) TEAM RESPONSIBILITIES

A BOT evaluation team is selected which is as broadly representative as possible of the education profession. The size of the team and the expertise of the members are appropriate for the kinds, size, and number of programs. Team members are recommended by their peers and selected by staff serving the Board of Teaching and then approved by the institution. During the on-site review a team of evaluators will seek to confirm/verify the accuracy and completeness of the written report prepared by the institution.

BOT TEAM	NCATE TEAM
2 members representing higher education	4-6 members representing higher education
1-2 members representing K-12 schools	Usually 2 members representing K-12 schools
BOT Staff as Team Chair	NCATE Team Chair
Possibly a Board of Teaching Member as an observer	Possibly an observer from teachers union: Education Minnesota
Expenses mainly paid by the Board of Teaching	Expenses paid by the institution

EVALUATION TEAM RESPONSIBILITIES:

The Board of Teaching conducts a 3.5 day visit (Sunday-Wednesday) and joins the NCATE team that is usually already on campus.

The purpose of the on-site visit is:

- (1) To verify the accuracy and completeness of the written report prepared by the institution
- (2) To write a report of team findings
- (3) To make a recommendation to the Board of Teaching regarding approval status of the institution to prepare persons for teacher licensure.

During the institutional visit, team members review written information and interview persons who have relevant information concerning the institution. Team members then meet together to study findings and reach consensus concerning the team report and recommendation. In addition to listing specific findings for each standard, the team recommends one of the following as the approval status of the institution: Initial Approval, Continuing Approval, Approval with Conditions, or Disapproval. A report of the team findings is sent to the unit head within thirty days of the on-site review. The institution has thirty days in which to respond or to submit additional information.

The team's approval recommendation, along with a summary of the findings and any additional information presented by the institution is forward to the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching for Board action. The decision of the Board of Teaching regarding approval status of the institution to prepare persons for teacher licensure is forwarded by the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching to the chief administrative officer of the institution with a copy going to the college/department of education.

If an institution is approved with conditions, the Board of Teaching states the conditions and establishes timelines for meeting the stated conditions. The chief administrative officer of the institution files a formal plan with the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching specifying how the institution proposes to meet the stated conditions. The Executive Director of the Board of Teaching monitors the implementation of the plan and determines when stated conditions have been met. Approval status of the institution will be reconsidered by the Board of Teaching upon verification by the Executive Director that stated conditions have been met. If stated conditions are not met within the established timelines, conditional approval is withdrawn by the Board of Teaching.

If an institution is disapproved, the Board of Teaching states the reasons for disapproval and, if needed, stipulates a termination date, which accommodates persons currently enrolled in teacher licensure programs.

An institution that is denied approval by the Board of Teaching is entitled to a hearing (8700.7600, subpart 11). A written request for a hearing must be filed by the institution with the Board of Teaching within 30 days from the date of the denial. Failure to do so constitutes a waiver of the right to a hearing.

CAMPUS WORKROOM (Also See Appendix C)

The on- campus workroom is shared by both the State team and the NCATE visiting team.

During the on-site visit the team is provided a workroom/exhibit room on campus for team members to confer and review supportive documentation. Preparing an electronic report now provides the institution increased flexibility regarding the contents of the exhibit room.

Most exhibits (supportive documentation) will be hyperlinked within the Institutional Report.

However, feel free to include supportive, hard copy materials, in the exhibit room (examples might be: faculty publications, meeting minutes, candidate portfolios, and K-12 learner work samples). It is helpful if team members can access most of the supportive documentation via the electronic report prior to their arrival on campus.

The campus exhibit room will also serve as the on campus work room for the evaluation teams.

- The campus workroom should be one large workroom that will comfortably accommodate both teams (8-12 individuals). Interviews and other meetings should not be scheduled to occur in this room during the visit. Interviews with individuals, administrators/faculty/students should be scheduled in different spaces. The workroom needs to be reserved for the exclusive use of the teams during the visit. Team members are often conferring and college/university personnel should minimize the interruptions. Team members may be asked to step outside to confer with campus personnel, so that the work of team members is not interrupted.
- All hard copies and/or files in the exhibit room must be clearly labeled and organized according to standards in a readily available and visible design. **For concurrent visits, the exhibits must be cross-referenced (labeled) with Board of Teaching standards, as well as NCATE standards.** An index of all supporting documents (hard copy and those electronically linked), organized by BOT standards, and should be provided (see **Appendix G**). This index is designed to assist the State team to easily locate materials according to state standards. (In the exhibit room *documents that attend to more than one standard may be duplicated. However, if a document is large, a cross reference sheet indicating “See exhibit (X)” can be included to direct the team member to its location*).

- The workroom for the team should contain one computer for each team member.

Computers should be connected to a printer. Individual flash drives have helped team members share findings and notes. Together the team chairs and the college will review the team needs at the pre-visit. Other materials that might be included are: pads, post-its, markers, and pens, blank diskettes (general array of note taking materials for the team).

The BOT team will occupy the workroom beginning Monday (7:30 – 5:30) and Tuesday 7:30-5:30 p.m. The BOT team will not use the workroom on campus on Wednesday.

- On the final day of the visit (Wednesday) the institution should provide the team chair with an electronic copy of all persons interviewed containing the names, titles, and relationship to the institution of each person the team interviewed.

THE PRE-VISIT

The team chairs (State and NCATE) conduct a pre-visit to the institution several months before the scheduled institutional visit. The pre-visit is usually no longer than 3-4 hours in length. The pre-visit should include the unit head, and the unit's coordinator of the visit, if one is assigned. The team chairs must receive the draft Institutional Report before the pre-visit so he/she can provide the most help to the unit as it finalizes preparations for the visit.

In consultation with the team chairs, the institution will arrange for and interview schedule and off-campus visits as outlined in the sample schedule (See **APPENDIX D**). Once on-site, the team may need to conduct follow-up interviews with some individuals to clarify issues and/or concerns raised during the team's deliberations. Because the size of the BOT team is small, the team will not have time to interview all professional education faculty except perhaps during group interviews.

The team chairs should also meet with the president/chancellor and/or the provost or Vice-president during the pre-visit to provide an overview of the upcoming visit, to answer questions about the review process, and to determine what he/she would like to learn from the visit. This meeting gives the chief executive officer the opportunity to provide input at an early stage of the review process. This initial meeting should be less than 20 minutes.

The following items should be discussed during the pre visit meeting:

- Roles of team members, state consultant, state team, key institutional representatives
- Organization and contents of the exhibit room
- Need for nametags for the team members so that they can be clearly identified by institutional representatives during interviews.

- For concurrent visits, the Board of Teaching has requested that the institution make arrangements for, and pay for, a hotel workroom for the BOT team as it does for the NCATE team.
- Interviews and school visits schedules
- Exit report time
- the organization of the Sunday evening meeting with institutional representatives
- Materials to be sent to the team chair before the visit and timeline
- Logistical arrangements for travel, hotel requirements, meals and refreshments, and the team workroom on campus
- Technology requirements for teams on campus and at the hotel workroom

Team Expenses:

The Board of Teaching assumes responsibility for expenses of the Board of Teaching Team and reimburses team members in accordance with state rules for food and mileage costs.

Hotel Accommodations:

It is important the State team and the NCATE team stay at the same hotel. This close proximity will assist the sharing of materials that the institution provides as well as places a state contact person close to NCATE in the event that state practices or policies need clarification.

The chair of the evaluation team would appreciate the institution suggesting the hotel(s) in the area that might be best suited to accommodate both teams. The chair should be notified early (6-9 months), so that the BOT office may make arrangements for the Board of Teaching team. The expenses for the sleeping rooms at the hotel will be paid by the Board of Teaching.

Meals/Lunches: While on campus the team will either take lunch at the campus cafeteria or arrange with the dean/chair for lunches to be brought in for a working lunch. When using campus facilities for meals, team members will pay for and submit expense forms to the state. Often, the two teams will share a working lunch in the workroom, or request a conference room. In that situation, it is often most convenient if the institution coordinates the lunch for both teams. The institution will assume responsibility for the dinner and/or reception at the Sunday evening initial overview meeting. Team members provide a voluntary professional service and always appreciate having refreshments while working, like soft drinks, coffee, water, and snacks available in the workroom both on campus and at the hotel. Additionally, if the hotel does not offer a free continental breakfast, we have found that having a similar “breakfast” choice in the workroom maximizes the teams’ work time on Monday and Tuesday mornings.

Transportation and Parking:

Depending on the parking situation on campus, the institution may shuttle the team(s) to and from the hotel, or you may decide to furnish parking permits for the 3.5 days the team is on campus. On Tuesday morning the institution will need to transport selected team members to partnership school sites.

Other Needs:

1. Telephone access where team members may make or receive work related and/or family related telephone calls
2. Access to student and faculty records while on campus
3. Copying, printing, and computer services on campus
4. Faculty directory and someone to assist in scheduling additional and/or follow-up interviews, if necessary
5. Suggestions and/or a menu for the selection of a restaurant for a team working dinner on Monday and Tuesday

SAMPLE BOT SCHEDULE: SUNDAY EVENING:

- Team members will arrive at the hotel at 3:00 p.m. for orientation and training. The state team will not need access to campus work room facilities until Monday morning.
- A team dinner and/or reception with administrators and education faculty is coordinated by the institution for 6:00-7:30 p.m. Many institutions have substituted a poster session or presentation for the “sit down” dinner. The institution will determine whether the dinner/reception will be held at the hotel or on campus and who from the institution will attend. This is the only social event that should be scheduled for the team while on campus.

The dean/chair should coordinate the dinner to include:

- Welcoming remarks
 - Introductions of institution attendees
 - Brief presentation highlighting history, size, vision for, and activities of the institution (Sometimes this focuses on special projects, partnerships, cross campus collaboration).
- The team will return to the hotel on Sunday evening at 7:30 PM to continue preparing for the visit.

MONDAY (8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.)

- Individual and group interviews will be coordinated to occur on Monday and Tuesday between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.
- The evaluation team returns to the hotel at 5:00-5:30 p.m. for team discussion and planning.

TUESDAY (8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.)

- Individual and group interviews will be coordinated to occur on Monday and Tuesday between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.
- If possible, the team would like a block of time “free of interviews” on Tuesday afternoon, so that they may confer and begin to write the report.

- The evaluation team returns to the hotel at 5:00-5:30 p.m. for team discussion and planning. Team reporting session and writing reports.

WEDNESDAY a.m.

- The team chair will provide an oral exit report. The Board of Teaching Team holds a final reporting session with the administrators and invitees of the institution. The chair reports team recommendation and relevant findings to support the recommendation.
- The exit report should be scheduled for 20 minutes beginning around 10:00. The reporting session is not a time for questions and/or discussion. A draft of the written report will be forwarded to the unit administrator within 30 days from the day the team leaves campus. Comments and/or responses to the team's recommendation and findings may be submitted to the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching within 30 days of receiving the drafted report.
- The Final Report and any written response submitted by the institution will be sent to the Board of Teaching for final action. Based on the team report and institutional response, the Board of Teaching will take action on approval status of the institution. Following Board action, the unit head will receive written notification from the Executive Director of the Board of Teaching.

TIMELINE FOR ON-SITE EVALUATION VISIT

Twelve months prior to review date	Twelve months prior to the proposed visit, the Board of Teaching will contact the institution to set the actual date that the evaluation visit will occur. Evaluation visits are schedule in the fall or spring of the year. In accordance with the STATE/NCATE Partnership Protocol the institution must first coordinate with the state a possible date for the review to occur. That agreed upon date is then submitted to NCATE for consideration and coordination.
Six months prior to scheduled visit	Approximately six months before the on-site evaluation visit, the chair of the Board of Teaching evaluation team and the NCATE chair and the unit chair will agree on a pre-visit date. The pre-visit takes approximately 3 to 4 hours and is the time to coordinate expectations and activities for the upcoming visit.
Three months prior to the scheduled visit	Approximately 3 months before the actual visit, the Board of Teaching will send a slate of potential team members to the institution for review and approval. The administrator of the defined administrative and instructional unit of the institution and the Board of Teaching team chair shall negotiate team membership from a slate of possible evaluators provided by the Board of Teaching. If agreement is not reached regarding team membership, the Board of Teaching shall appoint the slate of team members.
One month prior to the visit	No less than 4 weeks prior to the date of the on-site visit the institution will send a complete set of materials (link to Institutional Report, Welcome Letter, and any supplemental materials the institution selects to send in advance (such as links to college catalogs, maps, organization charts, etc) to each member on the state team. A cross-reference (electronic index) must be developed by the institution that identifies the Board of Teaching Standards aligned to NCATE standards and linked to the evidence in the report.

APPENDIX A

At the time of the Board of Teaching's onsite institutional review, the team will confirm that the institution is in compliance with MN Statutes 122A.09 subd. 4 (c) and (f).

1) Institutions must evidence that subd 4 (c) is addressed by having this dispute resolution option published in student handbooks, or advising guides, websites, or similar public postings where students would likely look for such information.

2) To evidence compliance with subd 4 (f) regarding education faculty's recent experiences in public schools, the institution should prepare a chart of education faculty employed during the last five years which indicates each faculty persons' experiences working directly with elementary or secondary school teachers in elementary or secondary schools during that time period.

122A.09 DUTIES.

Subdivision 1. **Code of ethics.** The Board of Teaching must develop by rule a code of ethics covering standards of professional teaching practices, including areas of ethical conduct and professional performance and methods of enforcement.

Subd. 2. **Advise members of profession.** The board must act in an advisory capacity to members of the profession in matters of interpretation of the code of ethics.

Subd. 3. **Election of chair and officers.** The board shall elect a chair and such other officers as it may deem necessary.

Subd. 4. **License and rules.** (a) The board must adopt rules to license public school teachers and interns subject to chapter 14.

(b) The board must adopt rules requiring a person to successfully complete a skills examination in reading, writing, and mathematics as a requirement for initial teacher licensure. Such rules must require college and universities offering a board-approved teacher preparation program to provide remedial assistance to persons who did not achieve a qualifying score on the skills examination, including those for whom English is a second language.

(c) The board must adopt rules to approve teacher preparation programs. **The board, upon the request of a postsecondary student preparing for teacher licensure or a licensed graduate of a teacher preparation program, shall assist in resolving a dispute between the person and a postsecondary institution providing a teacher preparation program when the dispute involves an institution's recommendation for licensure affecting the person or the person's credentials. At the board's discretion, assistance may include the application of chapter 14. (We will check that this information has been published for students.)**

(d) The board must provide the leadership and shall adopt rules for the redesign of teacher education programs to implement a research based, results-oriented curriculum that focuses on the skills teachers need in order to be effective. The board shall implement new systems of teacher preparation program evaluation to assure program effectiveness based on proficiency of graduates in demonstrating attainment of program outcomes.

(e) The board must adopt rules requiring successful completion of an examination of general pedagogical knowledge and examinations of licensure-specific teaching skills. The rules shall be effective on the dates determined by the board but not later than September 1, 2001.

(f) The board must adopt rules requiring teacher educators to work directly with elementary or secondary school teachers in elementary or secondary schools to obtain periodic exposure to the elementary or secondary teaching environment.

(Compliance will be checked while the team is on campus as part of the faculty qualifications standards.)

(g) The board must grant licenses to interns and to candidates for initial licenses.

(h) The board must design and implement an assessment system which requires a candidate for an initial license and first continuing license to demonstrate the abilities necessary to perform selected, representative teaching tasks at appropriate levels.

(i) The board must receive recommendations from local committees as established by the board for the renewal of teaching licenses.

(j) The board must grant life licenses to those who qualify according to requirements established by the board, and suspend or revoke licenses pursuant to sections [122A.20](#) and [214.10](#).

The board must not establish any expiration date for application for life licenses.

(k) The board must adopt rules that require all licensed teachers who are renewing their continuing license to include in their renewal requirements further preparation in the areas of using positive behavior interventions and in accommodating, modifying, and adapting curricula, materials, and strategies to appropriately meet the needs of individual students and ensure adequate progress toward the state's graduation rule.

(l) In adopting rules to license public school teachers who provide health-related services for disabled children, the board shall adopt rules consistent with license or registration requirements of the commissioner of health and the health-related boards who license personnel who perform similar services outside of the school.

(m) The board must adopt rules that require all licensed teachers who are renewing their continuing license to include in their renewal requirements further reading preparation, consistent with section [122A.06, subdivision 4](#). The rules do not take effect until they are approved by law. Teachers who do not provide direct instruction including, at least, counselors, school psychologists, school nurses, school social workers, audiovisual directors and coordinators, and recreation personnel are exempt from this section.

(n) The board must adopt rules that require all licensed teachers who are renewing their continuing license to include in their renewal requirements further preparation in understanding the key warning signs of early-onset mental illness in children and adolescents.

Subd. 5. Commissioner's representative to comment on proposed rule. Prior to the adoption by the Board of Teaching of any rule which must be submitted to public hearing, a representative of the commissioner shall appear before the Board of Teaching and at the hearing required pursuant to section [14.14, subdivision 1](#), to comment on the cost and educational implications of that proposed rule.

Subd. 6. Register of persons licensed. The executive secretary of the Board of Teaching shall keep a record of the proceedings of and a register of all persons licensed pursuant to the provisions of this chapter. The register must show the name, address, license number and the renewal of the license. The board must on July 1, of each year or as soon thereafter

as is practicable, compile a list of such duly licensed teachers and transmit a copy of the list to the board. A copy of the register must be available during business hours at the office of the board to any interested person.

Subd. 7. **Commissioner's assistance; board money.** The commissioner shall provide all necessary materials and assistance for the transaction of the business of the Board of Teaching and all moneys received by the Board of Teaching shall be paid into the state treasury as provided by law. The expenses of administering sections [122A.01](#), [122A.05](#) to [122A.09](#), [122A.15](#), [122A.16](#), [122A.17](#), [122A.18](#), [122A.20](#), [122A.21](#), [122A.22](#), [122A.23](#), [122A.26](#), [122A.30](#), [122A.32](#), [122A.40](#), [122A.41](#), [122A.42](#), [122A.45](#), [122A.49](#), [122A.52](#), [122A.53](#), [122A.54](#), [122A.55](#), [122A.56](#), [122A.57](#), and [122A.58](#) which are incurred by the Board of Teaching shall be paid for from appropriations made to the Board of Teaching.

Subd. 8. **Fraud; gross misdemeanor.** A person who claims to be a licensed teacher without a valid existing license issued by the board or any person who employs fraud or deception in applying for or securing a license is guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

Subd. 9. **Board may adopt rules.** The Board of Teaching may adopt rules subject to the provisions of chapter 14 to implement sections [122A.05](#) to [122A.09](#), [122A.16](#), [122A.17](#), [122A.18](#), [122A.20](#), [122A.21](#), and [122A.23](#).

Subd. 10. **Variances.** (a) Notwithstanding subdivision 9 and section [14.05, subdivision 4](#), the Board of Teaching may grant a variance to its rules upon application by a school district for purposes of implementing experimental programs in learning or management.

(b) To enable a school district to meet the needs of students enrolled in an alternative education program and to enable licensed teachers instructing those students to satisfy content area licensure requirements, the Board of Teaching annually may permit a licensed teacher teaching in an alternative education program to instruct students in a content area for which the teacher is not licensed, consistent with paragraph (a).

(c) A special education license variance issued by the Board of Teaching for a primary employer's low-incidence region shall be valid in all low-incidence regions.

APPENDIX B

**NCATE/State Partnership Protocol for
INITIAL/CONTINUING/PROBATION REVIEWS
of Professional Education Units in the State of Minnesota**

Team Composition:
Concurrent

Program Review:
State-Based

Effective:
Jan. 2006-Dec. 2011

Original Partnership Agreement Date: 1994

Category	NCATE policy & options	State additions/response
I. Standards		
A. Unit Standards	NCATE unit standards apply to the professional education unit. Specific State criteria, as determined by the State Agency, and institutional criteria as determined by the institution or higher education commission, may also be applied to units and/or programs being reviewed by NCATE and the State.	
B. State Program Standards	NCATE defers to the State's review of the unit's programs if the teacher education program standards or licensing standards and the State's review processes are sufficiently similar to NCATE's, as determined by the State Partnership Board (SPB). Program National Recognition: The State may choose to seek authority for State program approval to be accepted as national recognition of the unit's programs by NCATE's SPAs in the NCATE list of nationally recognized programs. If the State is not authorized to recommend national recognition, the unit may seek national recognition of a program by submitting its program for review through NCATE.	NCATE program documents (folios) are not required. Board of Teaching standards applies to the unit. Standards are set forth in Minnesota Rules, Part 8700.7600-Institutional Approval and Teacher Education Program Evaluation.
II. Team		
A. Team Composition: Concurrent NCATE and State Teams	The NCATE team is selected from NCATE's Board of Examiners (BOE). The team includes representatives from organizations of teacher educators, teachers, education specialists and/or policy makers. Non-voting members of the team include the State Consultant (usually the NCATE State Partnership Contact, or his/her designee), and a representative from	The State Chairperson appoints a team from a pool of persons representing K-12 education and higher education. The State team determines whether Board of Teaching standards have been met. Minnesota unit standards are congruent with NCATE unit standards. Both State and NCATE team members convene and share the interviews and

Category	NCATE policy & options	State additions/response
	the state affiliate of NEA and/or AFT. Team assignments are systematically made to ensure that conflicts of interest are avoided. The NCATE team sends its findings to NCATE and the State Consultant.	meetings coordinated for the on-site review.
B. Training Expectations: Concurrent	NCATE team members must participate in the NCATE-sponsored BOE training.	The State team verifies compliance with State unit standards, and is selected by the State Agency in compliance with conflict of interest guidelines. Board of Teaching team members participate in an orientation and training session on Board of Teaching unit standards.
C. Team Size: Concurrent	For first, continuing, and probation visits, the BOE team will include 5-8 members depending on several factors, including the number and size of the unit's programs, and the State Partnership Agreement. For focused visits, the team will include 2-3 BOE members.	Initial Approval: A review is assigned a four-member team if it has no programs beyond the master's; a five-six member team may be selected for a unit with post-master's programs. The Board of Teaching staff member serves as Chair. <i>Conditional Revisit:</i> If the state requires a revisit the size of team will be three or four. Continuing visits: The size of teams will be three to five members. If NCATE requires a focus visit a state representative may be assigned, depending on resources and availability.
D. Chair Responsibilities: Concurrent	An NCATE BOE team member is appointed chair. The chair has overall responsibility for planning and conducting the visit. The chair conducts a pre-visit approximately 60 days before the visit to plan interviews and finalize the logistics for the visit. The State Consultant should participate in the pre-visit. The chair assigns roles and responsibilities to the BOE team members.	The chair of the State team is the Teacher Education Specialist of the MN Department of Education representing the Board of Teaching. The Board of Teaching and the NCATE chairs meet with the unit head and/or designee to plan collaboratively for a concurrent visit. This pre-visit occurs at the institution within 60 days prior to the on-site visit. The State chair assigns roles and responsibilities to the State team members.
E. Consultants/Other Participants	NCATE invites the State education agencies to appoint a "State Consultant" to advise the team on State requirements, nomenclature, and special circumstances. The State Consultant's expenses are covered by the respective agency. The State Consultant facilitates an orientation to the State Partnership at a team meeting prior to the review activities.	A Board of Teaching member may be appointed at the discretion of the State chair. If appointed, the Board member is a non-voting member of the BOEW team. The Board member may provide clarification and information regarding state initiatives that impact teacher preparation and institutions. These observers can assist the BOE team

Category	NCATE policy & options	State additions/response
	The consultant is usually the State Partnership Contact, but may be his/her designee, and is a non-voting member of the BOE team. The State Consultant may serve as a voting member of the State team, if so designated by the State. A few states (e.g., SC and FL) may have consultants from two agencies.	with the collection of data, interviews, and the editing of the team report. However, they should not be assigned a primary writing assignment. Observers are non-voting members of the BOE team.
F. NEA/AFT Representatives	NCATE invites the State affiliates of the NEA and AFT to appoint observers for the on-site visit in partnership States. The participants' respective agencies are responsible for their travel and maintenance expenses. These observers can assist the BOE team with the collection of data, interviews, and the editing of the team report. However, they should not be assigned a primary writing assignment. Observers are non-voting members of the BOE team.	An Education Minnesota observer may be appointed at the discretion of the organization (union).
G. Decision-making	Decisions are usually made through consensus-driving discussions of whether standards are met. When consensus cannot be reached, a vote may be taken.	State team members judge compliance with State unit standards through a consensus process. Specific program reviews are conducted under a separate process. All licensure programs are reviewed and approved prior to the arrival of a State or NCATE team.
H. Writing the Report: Concurrent	The NCATE chair assigns writing responsibilities to each team member. The BOE report includes the BOE team's responses to the 6 unit standards at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced levels as appropriate. If the State or institution has additional requirements, the report should have the BOE team's responses to the State/Institution requirements attached as a Report Addendum. The final report is compiled by the BOE chair. The draft of the BOE report should be completed by the end of the on-site visit. The BOE draft report should be sent to NCATE and the team members for editing, and to the unit for correction of factual errors. The BOE team chair e-mails one copy of the final report to the	The State Team Report consists of team judgments concerning the presence and quality of standards within each chapter, plus team member's findings, which support these judgments. The Team Report is an official record of team findings which recommends approval status of the unit within 30 days of the visit.

Category	NCATE policy & options	State additions/response
	NCATE office and a copy to each member of the NCATE team within 30 days following the visit.	
I. Evaluations	Following the on-site visit, the performance of BOE members is evaluated electronically by the unit, the other national and State BOE members, and State consultants who served on the same visiting team. The evaluations are used by NCATE and the State to determine who should continue BOE service and to identify potential team chairs.	Following the on-site visit the performance of each State team member is conducted by the State chair.
J. Expenses	During the semester of the visit, the unit will pay NCATE a Periodic Evaluation Fee of \$1,000 per NCATE BOE team member participating in the on-site visit.	The Minnesota Board of Teaching pays for the team expenses in accordance with state guidelines for travel, lodging, meals, and substitute teachers.
III. Preparation		
A. Units' Intent-to-Seek request	For initial accreditation, at least two years before hosting an on-site visit, the unit should indicate its interest in seeking accreditation. The request should include the semester and year in which the unit plans to host the on-site review.	Only institutions granted State approval may seek application for NCATE accreditation. In accordance with Board Rules, an institution must apply at least one year prior to the requested review.
B. NCATE materials	In response to interest request, NCATE provide we blinks to the following materials: Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education; Handbook for Accreditation Visits; "Intent to Seek NCATE accreditation" form – TO BE SUBMITTED 2 YEARS BEFORE THE VISIT; Timeline for semester and year of visit List of NCATE partnership States; and Other accreditation information	Complete Handbooks for preparing for the State Review are available upon request and are disseminated to institutions 12-16 months prior to the anticipated review.
C. Preconditions	For first visits, the unit responds to the preconditions found on the NCATE website. The preconditions report must be submitted to the NCATE office at least eighteen months prior to the on-site visit.	The unit responds to the preconditions found on NCATE's website. One copy of the preconditions report is sent to the NCATE office and one copy is sent to the Board of Teaching chair.

Category	NCATE policy & options	State additions/response
	All accredited units <i>must continue to meet the preconditions</i> for continued NCATE accreditation. Annually, NCATE reviews Title II test data and will request additional information from the unit that no longer meets the required State pass rate.	
D. Program Reports	<p>If the Partnership Agreement requires the unit is required to submit program reports, it must submit them by February 1 or September 15, two or three semesters before the continuing visit.</p> <p>For a continuing visit, NCATE requests the unit to verify online their “Status of Program Reviews,” approximately two years before the visit. This information will indicate which program reports to submit.</p> <p>For specific information on the preparation of program reports visit the NCATE website.</p>	The State’s program review is done electronically such that programs are approved at the time of the on-site visit.
E. Institutional Report	<p>The professional education unit is required to write and submit an Institutional Report (IR) that describes the unit’s conceptual framework and evidence that demonstrates that the 6 standards are met. In continuing accreditation visits, the IR also serves as a primary documentation of the unit’s growth and development since the last accreditation visit.</p> <p>The unit sends one copy of the IR and related links to undergraduate and graduate (if applicable) catalogs to each NCATE BOE team member, State consultant, and NEA/AFT observers. Either an electronic copy of the Institutional Report is sent to NCATE, or the unit may send two paper copies.</p>	<p>The unit prepares an electronic self-study responding to the unit standards. The NCATE Institutional Report may be used. A cross-reference to NCATE with State standards (electronic index) must be developed by the institution that identifies the Board of Teaching Standards to appropriate pages and documents of the NCATE standards.</p> <p><i>The unit should submit a copy of each annual AACTE/NCATE completed since the time of the last on-site BOT evaluation.</i></p> <p>The unit provides a complete set of materials (IR, catalogs, handbooks, electronic cd) to the chair and each team member.</p>
F. Dates of On-Site Visit	<p>NCATE requests units to submit its preferred visit date to NCATE at least 1 year prior to the on-site visit. Units in Partnership States must have the date approved by the State Agency prior to submitting its request to NCATE.</p> <p>The State Agency must first agree to requests for a delay in the visit, before submitting the delay request to NCATE.</p>	<p>Semester and years are negotiated between the State and NCATE to coordinate NCATE accredited units into concurrent State schedules for conducting evaluation visits.</p> <p>Institutions must contact the State to determine dates to coordinate with NCATE.</p> <p>State teams are on campus from Sunday 3:00 PM to Wednesday noon.</p>

Category	NCATE policy & options	State additions/response
	Visits are scheduled from Saturday through Wednesday excepting special circumstances.	
F. Pre-visit	The pre-visit should be scheduled about 60 days before the on-site visit. See the <i>Handbook for Accreditation Visits</i> for further details. The State Consultant, BOE chair, head of the unit, and NCATE coordinator should be present. If the visit is joint or concurrent, the State team chair should also participate in the pre-visit.	The Board of Teaching chair and the NCATE chair meet with the institution's unit head and/or designee to plan collaboratively for a concurrent visit. The pre-visit occurs at the institution within 60 days prior to the on-site visit.
H. 3rd Party Testimony	Six months before the on-site review, the unit must publish a “Call for Comment” inviting 3 rd party testimony related to the upcoming NCATE visit to be sent to NCATE. Two to three months before the on-site review, NCATE sends copies of any third-party testimony it received to the unit for comment and to the BOE team chair.	
IV. On-Site Review		
A. Orientation to State Process/ Protocol	If the visit is being conducted jointly or concurrently, the State Consultant (or his/her designee) will facilitate an orientation to the State process and Protocol.	The State chair will coordinate with the NCATE chair a time to provide an orientation to State standards and State initiatives that may impact teacher preparation.
B. Conducting the On-Site Review	The NCATE template for on-site visits guides the conduct of the visit as outlined in the <i>NCATE Handbook for Accreditation Visits</i> and on the NCATE website.	Collaboration for the on-site visit guides the work of the teams. The chairs of the NCATE and Board of Teaching teams plan for joint interviews as appropriate.
C. Evidence/Exhibit Room	Electronic exhibit rooms are encouraged. Access NCATE’s electronic exhibit room guidelines . Performance-based evidence that demonstrates what candidates know and are able to do must be included in the exhibit room. Units must provide data from: 1) Assessments at admissions; 2) State licensure tests; 3) internship assessments; and 4) follow-up studies. For other assessment data examples, see “Assessing Education Candidate Performance: A Look at Changing Practices.”	An NCATE member and State member are paired to collect evidence on both State and NCATE standards. The materials assembled for the exhibit room are shared by both teams and are cross referenced to State standards by the unit.
D. BOE Report	The BOE report includes the BOE team’s responses to the 6 unit standards at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced levels as	During the institutional visit, team members review written information and interview persons who have relevant

Category	NCATE policy & options	State additions/response
	<p>appropriate. If the State/Institution has additional requirements, the report should have the BOE team's responses to the State requirements attached as a State Addendum. The final report is compiled by the BOE chair.</p> <p>The BOE team chair e-mails one copy of the final BOE Report to the NCATE office and a copy to each member of the NCATE team within 30 days following the visit.</p>	<p>information concerning the institution. Team members then meet together to study findings and reach consensus concerning the team report and recommendation</p> <p>The State team chair compiles the team findings and writes the report. Within thirty days following the visit, a copy is sent to the dean/chair for response.</p> <p>The institution has 30 days in which to respond if it chooses to do so and to submit the comments to the chair of the BOT team.</p> <p>Based on the team report and any additional response received from the institution, the Board of Teaching will take action on approval of the institution.</p>
E. Exit Conference	An exit conference is conducted before the team departs Wednesday. It is conducted by the NCATE team chair, State team chair, and State Consultants. The unit is represented by the unit head and coordinator of the NCATE review; the president and/or provost may also attend.	<p>A reporting session is held with administrators and faculty selected by the unit head.</p> <p>The Board of Teaching chair reports team findings and recommended approval status.</p>
V. After the On-Site Review		
A. BOE report sent from NCATE	NCATE mails two copies of the report to the unit and one copy to the appropriate State Agencies.	A copy of the Final Report is mailed to the dean/chair of the unit for comment or acceptance. A copy of the report is forwarded to the chair of the NCATE team.
B. Rejoinder	The unit submits to NCATE and the State an electronic copy, or five hard copies, of its rejoinder to the BOE report within 30 days after receipt of the BOE Report.	The unit has 30 days in which to respond if it chooses to do so and to submit the comments to the chair of the Board of Teaching team.
C. Accreditation & Approval	<p>NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) is responsible for determining the accreditation status of professional education units, during meetings twice a year. In most cases, accreditation decisions are rendered at the UAB meeting in the semester that follows the BOE review.</p> <p>NCATE provides written notice of all accreditation decisions to the U.S. Department of Education, the appropriate state licensing or authorizing agency, all institutional accrediting agencies recognized by the U.S. Department of Education</p>	

Category	NCATE policy & options	State additions/response
	and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, and the public (via the NCATE website) More information about reporting accreditation decisions may be found in NCATE's Policies on Dissemination of Information. Definitions of NCATE accreditation decisions can also be found on NCATE's website or in the Handbook for Accreditation Visits.	
D. Final Action Report	Within 30 days after NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board takes action on the accreditation of the unit, NCATE sends the chief executive officer and head of the professional education unit a letter that indicates the official action.	Based on the team report and any additional response received from the unit, the Board of Teaching will take action on approval of the unit.
E. Appeal Procedure	Units may appeal any of the following Unit Accreditation Board decisions: Provisional Accreditation, Accreditation with Conditions, Revocation of Accreditation, and Probation. See NCATE's website at for specific policies and procedures related to the appeals process.	Appeal of board decision. Decisions by the Board of Teaching regarding approval status of an institution or preparation program to prepare persons for teacher licensure may be appealed by the institution pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, chapter 14.
VI. On-Going Responsibilities		
A. Protocol Distribution	NCATE will post the State Partnership Protocol on its website; it is also available in hard copy upon request. States will distribute the protocol to all units following the creation/renewal of a Partnership or after either party makes revisions.	
B. Accreditation Cycle	Units that receive accreditation for the first time will be scheduled for their next visit five years from the semester in which their visit occurred. Units that receive continuing accreditation will be scheduled for their next visit seven years from the semester in which their visit occurred. The seven-year cycle of visits apply only if the State has agreed to a seven-year cycle. Units may host a probationary or focused visit as a result of conditional or provisional accreditation; visits will be within 2 years of the UAB's decision.	Units in the State of Minnesota have moved to a seven-year cycle after the first continuing accreditation review. <hr/>

Category	NCATE policy & options	State additions/response
C. Code of Conduct	To assure units and the public that NCATE reviews are impartial and objective, to avoid conflicts of interest, and to promote equity and high ethical standards in the accreditation system, BOE members, board members, program reviewers, and staff shall follow NCATE's Code of Conduct , in the Handbook for Accreditation Visits and on NCATE's website. Violation of any part of the Code of Conduct could result in the board member's removal from the board.	Board training for team members addresses the Code of Conduct which includes confidentiality clauses.
D. Annual Reviews		
1. Regional Accreditation	Units must maintain regional accreditation in order to continue its NCATE accreditation.	
2. Change in State Status	The State will provide to NCATE its policy leading to a "Change in State Status." The State will notify NCATE within thirty days of action taken that an NCATE unit has had a Change in State Status. Notification of an NCATE accredited unit's Change in State Status by the State will initiate a review by Nate's <i>Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee</i> . The NCATE president will notify the unit that the State has informed NCATE of a change in their state status and require the unit to submit a special report within 90 days.	
3. Precondition 7	The unit's programs are approved by the appropriate State agency or agencies, and, in States with educator licensing examinations and required pass rates, the unit's summary pass rate meets or exceeds the required State pass rate.	
4. Annual Report	Submission of the Annual Report is a requirement for all units that are accredited by NCATE or are candidates or pre-candidates for NCATE accreditation. Annual Reports are due October 1 st and should be submitted electronically.	

APPENDIX C

While following the NCATE report guidelines the Institutional Report must also address each of the 53 Board of Teaching standards identified in 8700.7600, subpart 5. A cross-reference

(electronic index) must be developed by the institution that addresses the Board of Teaching Standards and guides the state team to appropriate pages of the NCATE report.

8700.7600		
Subpart 5. A. IN PROFESSIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL STUDIES		
	Board of Teaching	NCATE 2000
A(1)	The institution has high quality professional education programs that are cohesive, comprehensive, and based on research, theory, and accepted practice.	<i>Conceptual Framework</i>
A(2)	The institution requires that candidates in teacher preparation programs complete a professional sequence of courses based on the components under part 8710.2000.	<p>Standard 1: Pedagogical Content Knowledge Submitted documentation in program approval. Not to be duplicated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher candidates have a broad knowledge of instructional strategies that draws upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, <u>state</u>, and institutional standards to help all students learn The facilitate student learning of the subject matter through presentation of the content in clear and meaningful ways.
A(3)	Assessment and evaluation are integral components of the professional education sequence and are used to monitor teacher candidate performance and program effectiveness.	<p>Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unit has developed an assessment system with its professional community The units' system includes a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures that are used to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve operations. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments
<p>These are examples of types of evidence that might address the standards.</p> <p>Sources of Evidence: Institutional Report SEP documentation Copies of programs submitted Letters of approval from MDE/BOT Pieces of evidence related to standards that demonstrate development/design/assessment Assessment system plans and descriptions Results of assessments and evaluations</p> <p>Examples of persons who might be able to speak to the standards.</p> <p>Persons to Interview: The dean or chair of the professional education unit Working committees (unit and/or across campus) Dean of Arts and Sciences Arts and Science faculty Unit faculty Candidates and Cooperating Teachers</p>		

8700.7600**Subpart 5. B. IN GENERAL AND CONTENT STUDIES**

	<i>Board of Teaching</i>	<i>NCATE 2000</i>
B(1)	The institution provides and requires candidates in teacher preparation programs to complete a program of general studies in the liberal arts and sciences equivalent to the requirement for persons enrolled in programs not preparing persons for teacher licensure.	Standard 1: Content Knowledge Teacher candidates know the subject matter that they plan to teach as shown by their ability to explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional, <u>state</u> , and institutional standards Teacher candidates reflect a thorough understanding of pedagogical content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They have an in-depth understanding of the subject matter that they plan to teach, allowing them to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn. They present the content to students in challenging, clear, and compelling ways and integrate technology appropriately.
B(2)	The institution provides programs that require candidates in teacher preparation programs to attain academic competence in the content that they plan to teach.	Standard 1: Content Knowledge Teacher candidates know the subject matter that they plan to teach as shown by their ability to explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional, <u>state</u> , and institutional standards.
B(3)	The liberal arts curriculum of the institution incorporates multicultural and <u>global</u> perspectives.	
B(4)	Teacher candidates can integrate general, content, professional, and pedagogical studies, as measured by teacher performance, and performance of the students they teach.	Standard 1: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates use their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, <u>state</u> and institutional standards to facilitate learning. They consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work and the prior experiences of students to develop meaningful learning experiences.
Sources of evidence: Institutional Report College bulletins Advising sheets and related materials Syllabi Programs approved (subpart 1 – Subject Matter)		
Interview: The dean or chair of the professional education unit Working committees (unit and/or across campus) Dean of Arts and Sciences Arts and Science faculty Unit faculty		

8700.7600

Subpart 5. C. IN PROVIDING CLINICAL AND FIELD EXPERIENCES

Guidance: *The team needs to verify how the unit tracks/records the diverse clinical experiences of each candidate. Think about the best way to evidence that your system assures that all candidates meet the standards of this part.*

Supervision of student teachers requires multiple on site evaluations of the candidate teaching....how will you evidence this? These written evaluations must be in the candidates' files, and available to the team.

	<i>Board of Teaching</i>	<i>NCATE 2000</i>
C(1)	The teacher licensure programs incorporate a broad range of ongoing clinical and field experiences that provide candidates opportunities to demonstrate the required skills and knowledge under part 8710.2000.	<p>Standard 3 Design, Implementation and Evaluation</p> <p>Field experiences facilitate candidates' development as professional educators through observations in schools and other agencies, tutoring students, assisting teachers or other school personnel, attending school board meetings, and/or participating in education-related community events prior to clinical practice. Both field experiences and clinical practice reflect the unit's conceptual framework(s) and help candidates continue to develop their content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in standards.</p> <p>Standard 3 Students Learn:</p> <p>Clinical practice is sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing.</p> <p>Candidates, school faculty, and college/university faculty jointly conduct assessments of candidate performance throughout clinical practice. Both field experiences and clinical practice allow time for reflection and include feedback from peers and clinical faculty.</p> <p>Field experiences and clinical practice provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions for helping all students learn.</p>
C(2)	Candidates have experiences with diverse populations, students with disabilities, and students of different ages under the direction of teacher education faculty in collaboration with school partners.	<p>Standard 3 Students Learn:</p> <p>All candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups.</p> <p>Standard 4 Design, Implementation and Evaluation:</p> <p>Curriculum and accompanying field experiences are designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning.</p> <p>Standard 4 Design, Implementation and Evaluation:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates become aware of different teaching and learning styles due to cultural influences and are able to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities.
C(3)	Candidates work in the field and at the licensure level for which they are to be recommended for licensure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard 3 Design, Implementation and Evaluation Clinical practice is sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing.
C(4)	Each program is developed and implemented through collaborative school partnerships in which university faculty and school personnel share responsibility for planning, supervising, evaluating, and implementing the curriculum for candidates.	<p>Standard 3 Collaboration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unit, its school partners, and other members of the professional community design, deliver, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice to help candidates develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The unit and its school partners jointly determine the specific placement of student teachers and interns for other professional roles to provide an appropriate learning experience.
C(5)	School personnel hold valid Minnesota continuing licenses, or the equivalent, in the fields of specialization, and model good professional practice.	<p>Standard 3 Design, Implementation and Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria for clinical faculty are clear and known to all of the involved parties. Clinical faculty is accomplished school professionals. Clinical faculty provide regular and continuing support for student teachers and other interns through such processes as observations, conferencing, group discussions, email, and the use of other technologies.
<p>Sources of evidence: Institutional Report Descriptions of the field-experiences and field placements that demonstrate diversity of settings Roosters of student assignments Evaluation of candidates Summary results of candidate assessments upon entering and exiting experiences Student teaching assessment instruments Student teaching handbook</p> <p>Interviews: Director of clinical/field experiences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principals and cooperating teachers of schools where candidates complete field experiences The dean or chair of the unit Candidates <p>Faculty and school supervisors of field/clinical experiences</p>		

8700.7600**Subpart 5.D. FOR CANDIDATE QUALIFICATIONS**

	<i>Board of Teaching</i>	<i>NCATE 2000</i>
D(1)	The institution recruits, admits, and retains candidates who demonstrate potential for professional success in schools.	
D(2)	Multiple criteria and assessments are used to identify candidates for admission who have potential to become successful teachers.	Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at admission into programs, at appropriate transition points, and at program completion.
D(3)	The institution has clearly stated and applied assessment procedures for the admission of transfer, nontraditional, and post-baccalaureate candidates into undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation programs.	
D(4)	The institution actively recruits and has plans, policies, and practices for admission and retention of a diverse candidate population.	Standard 4: Diverse Candidates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The affirmation of the values of diversity is shown through good faith efforts being made to increase and/or maintain candidate diversity.
D(5)	The institution assesses and, if appropriate, gives credit to candidates for knowledge and skills acquired through prior academic preparation and teaching experiences that meet licensure requirements.	
Sources of evidence: Institutional Report Admission criteria Data on performance Policy statements/ plans for applied assessment procedures Descriptions and examples of multiple criteria Written plans for recruitment, including description of programs and results Interviews: Affirmative action officer or equivalent The dean or chair of the unit President/Vice President of Student Affairs/ Director of Clinical/field experiences Selected principals of schools where candidates complete field experience Faculty supervisors of clinical/field experiences Graduates Admission counselors Student advisors		

Subpart 5.E. WHEN MONITORING AND ADVISING ON CANDIDATE PROGRESS

Guidance for E6: the team needs evidence that the unit has a systematic way to verify that each candidate has met all the licensure/program requirements prior to being recommended for licensure. Who is checking, how is it documented?

	<i>Board of Teaching</i>	<i>NCATE 2000</i>
E(1)	The institution provides appropriate academic and professional advisement at a candidate's admission and throughout the candidate's professional education.	Standard 2 Assessment: Use of Data
E(2)	The institution maintains specific criteria for admission and retention, and defined student appeals process.	Standard 2 Assessment: Use of Data
E(3)	The institution maintains complete, accurate, and current records of candidates in teaching preparation programs.	Standard 2 Assessment: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unit maintains an assessment system that provides regular and comprehensive information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies
E(4)	The institution uses authentic performance-based assessments and systematic procedures and timelines to determine whether candidates have the knowledge and skills needed to advance through the program.	Standard 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These data are regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. Standard 4 Design, Implementation and Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessments of candidate proficiencies provide data on candidates' ability to help all students learn. Candidates' assessment data are used to provide feedback to candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
E(5)	Criteria consistent with part 8710.2000 are used to determine candidate progress through each program.	Standard 4: Evaluation of Curriculum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unit clearly articulates the proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop during their professional program.
E(6)	The institution requires that candidates successfully complete all Board of Teaching licensure assessments before recommending a candidate for teacher licensure.	
E(7)	Publication and faculty advising provide candidates with clear information about institutional policies and requirements needed to complete professional education programs, the availability of social and psychological counseling services, and job opportunities.	

Sources of evidence:

Data on performance of graduates
 Records of current performance assessments of candidate progress and summary results
 External assessment data
 Sample of complete records across programs
 References from 8710.2000
 Performance on state required examinations
 Advising and admission criteria materials
 Summaries of assessments of candidates, including those at entry, at critical points in candidate development, and prior to program completion

Interviews:

Admission officers (unit)
 Faculty advisors
 Review committees
 Dean/chair of unit
 Faculty in the unit
 Committee(s) on curriculum development

8700.7600

Subpart 5.F. FOR COMPETENCE OF CANDIDATES

GUIDANCE: to evidence the standards A3, F2 and F4 (assessment standards) the team will need to verify that the unit has identified key assessments applied to all candidates, and identified the standards those tools assess, and that data from those assessments are used to monitor candidates' progress through the program, and also that data are used to evaluate EACH licensure program's effectiveness.

	<i>Board of Teaching</i>	<i>NCATE 2000</i>
F(1)	The unit provides evidence that licensure candidates demonstrate the skills and knowledge required under part 8710.2000.	Reference: Accomplished with approval of Standards of Effective Practice
F(2)	The unit demonstrates a systematic and comprehensive assessment design that is applied to all candidates throughout professional preparation.	<i>Standard 2: Assessment System</i> The unit's system includes a comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures that are used to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve operations and programs.
F(3)	The unit establishes and publishes a set of criteria and outcomes for exit from each professional education program consistent with the standards of the Board of Teaching.	Reference: Accomplished with approval of Standards of Effective Practice
F(4)	The program's stated exit criteria and outcomes are assessed through the use of multiple sources of data, for example a culminating experience, portfolios, interviews, videotaped and observed performance in schools, standardized tests, and course grades.	<i>Standard 3: Students Learn</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Entry and exit criteria exist for candidates in clinical practice. Assessments used in clinical practice are linked to candidate competencies delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Multiple assessment strategies are used to evaluate candidates' performance and effect on student learning.
Sources of evidence: Institutional Report References to SEP review from MDE Assessment plan and related performance data Descriptions of exit criteria and how applied Interviews: The dean or chair of the professional unit Director of clinical/field experiences Unit and Arts and Science Faculty Counselors and advisors to education candidates Candidates Graduates Principals and cooperating teachers of schools where candidates complete field experiences.		

8700.7600

Subpart 5.G. FOR THE QUALIFICATIONS, COMPOSITION, AND ASSIGNMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FACULTY

Guidance: Faculty qualifications are expected to be met at the point of hire for all faculty teaching in licensure programs. A chart of the methods instructors and supervisors and their qualifications and teaching assignments is required. The chart should also indicate the instructors' recent experiences in P-12 school settings. Vitae need to be current and available.

The team will also need to verify that there are sufficient faculties with content expertise aligned to the subject matter programs offered by the unit.

	<i>Board of Teaching</i>	<i>NCATE 2000</i>
G(1)	The unit ensures that all education faculty are qualified by academic preparation for the faculty member's current assignments and are actively engaged in the professional community.	<i>Standard 5: Qualified Faculty</i>
G(2)	The unit assigns faculty qualified by academic preparation to support the teacher licensure programs.	<i>Standard 5: Qualify of Faculty</i> (specifically all non full time education faculty)
G(3)	The unit actively recruits and has plans, policies, and practices for hiring diverse faculty.	<i>Standard 4: Diverse Faculty</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good faith efforts being made to increase and/or maintain faculty diversity.
G(4)	The workload allows the faculty to be involved in teaching, scholarship, service, and schools in monitoring, assessing, and advising candidate progress.	<i>Standard 5: Facilitation of Professional Development</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Based upon needs identified in faculty evaluations, the unit provides opportunities for faculty to develop new knowledge and skills, especially as it relates to the conceptual framework, performance assessment, diversity, technology, and other emerging practices. <i>Standard 5: Personnel</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workload policies, including on-line course delivery, allow faculty members to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, collaborative work in P-12 schools, and service.
G(5)	The unit ensures that faculty who supervise field experiences are academically prepared and professionally experienced in a school setting.	<i>Standard 5: Qualified Faculty</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clinical faculty from higher education have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels which they supervise.
G(6)	Any part-time and adjunct faculty and graduate students in teaching roles provide integrity, quality, and continuity of teacher preparation programs.	<i>Standard 5 Personnel</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The makes appropriate use of full-time, part-time, and clinical faculty as well as graduate assistants so that program coherence and integrity are assured.
G(7)	Faculty and teaching in the unit are of high quality reflecting current research and best practice consistent with the curriculum goals of the program.	<i>Standard 5: Qualified Faculty</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculties have a thorough understanding of the content they teach. Teaching by professional education faculty reflects the unit's conceptual framework and research, theories, and current developments in their fields and teaching.
G(8)	Faculty and cooperating school personnel model and reflect the	<i>Standard 5 Modeling Best Practices</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty value candidates' learning and assess

	best practice in the delivery of instruction.	<p>candidate performance. Their teaching encourages candidates' development of reflection, critical thinking, and problem-solving and professional dispositions. Faculties use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different learning styles. They integrate diversity and technology throughout their teaching. They assess their own effectiveness as teachers, including the positive effects they have on performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are actively involved with the professional world of practice in P-12 schools.
G(9)	Faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different models and approaches to learning.	
G(10)	Instruction encourages the candidate's development of reflection, critical thinking, problem-solving, and professional dispositions.	
G(11)	Teaching in the unit reflects knowledge and experiences with diversity and exceptionalities.	<p><i>Standard 5 Modeling Best Practices</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They integrate diversity and technology throughout their teaching.
G(12)	The institution systematically evaluates the effect of faculty on candidate performance and fosters faculty professional development.	<p><i>Standard 5 Evaluation Faculty Performance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unit conducts systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty teaching performance to enhance the competence and intellectual vitality of the professional education faculty. Evaluations of professional education faculty are used to improve teaching, scholarship and service of unit faculty.
G(13)	The unit's faculty demonstrates knowledge, skills, and dispositions which model best professional practices, assessment, and scholarship	<p><i>Standard 5 Scholarship</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional education faculty demonstrate scholarly work in their field(s) of specialization. They are engaged in different types of scholarly work, based in part on the mission of their institutions.
<p>Sources of evidence: Institutional Report Faculty vitae List of faculty assignments and loads over time (1-2 semesters) Advising loads and descriptions of how assigned Samples of faculty publications and other scholarly activities Faculty qualifications and development activities Faculty evaluations and professional development plans Recruitment plans (programs, investments, results) Faculty reports on best practice Syllabi – examples of instructional strategies Student work (reflection, problem-solving, etc.) List of faculty (full-time unit; full-time college/part-time unit; adjunct and part time)</p> <p>Interviews: Dean or chair of unit Unit faculty Principals and cooperating teachers Candidates President/ Vice President (CEO) Multicultural and Affirmative Action Office</p>		

8700.7600

Subpart 5.H. FOR INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE

	<i>Board of Teaching</i>	<i>NCATE 2000</i>
H(1)	The professional education unit is clearly identified and has primary responsibility for all programs offered at the institution for the licensure of teachers and other professional school personnel.	<i>Standard 6 Unit Leadership and Authority</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The unit has the leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study. The unit effectively manages or coordinates all programs so that their candidates are prepared to meet standards.
H(2)	Responsibility and authority for teacher preparation programs are exercised by a defined administrative and instructional unit, for example a department, division, school, or college education.	
H(3)	The unit is directly involved in the areas of faculty selection, tenure, promotion, and retention decisions; recruitment of candidates; and curriculum decisions, evaluation, revision, and the allocation of resources for institution activities.	
H(4)	The administrator of the defined unit is authorized to submit licensure program proposals for Board of Teaching approval and is responsible for administering licensure programs.	
H(5)	The administrator of the defined unit is authorized to recommend for teacher licensure candidates who have completed the institution's teacher preparation programs.	Specific to Minnesota
H(6)	School faculty, candidates, and other members of the professional community are actively involved in the unit's policy making and advisory bodies.	<i>Standards 6 Unit Leadership and Authority</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faculty involved in the preparation of educators, P-12 practitioners, and other members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation and evaluation of the unit and its programs.
H(7)	The unit has a long-range planning process that is regularly monitored to ensure the ongoing vitality of the unit and its programs, and the future capacity of its physical facilities.	
H(8)	The unit has sufficient financial resources and institutional support to sustain teacher preparation programs.	<i>Standard 6 Unit Budget</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations at least proportional to other units on campus or similar units at other campuses to provide programs that prepare candidates to meet standards. The budget adequately supports on-campus and clinical work essential for preparation of professional educators.
H(9)	Facilities, equipment, and budgets are adequate to support the unit's missions and goals.	<i>Standard 6: Personnel</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The unit provides adequate resources ... <i>Standard 6: Unit Facilities</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The unit has adequate campus and school facilities to support candidates in meeting

		standards.
H(10)	Candidates and faculty have access to books, journals, and electronic information that support teaching and scholarship.	<p><i>Standard 6: Unit Resources</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unit allocates resources across programs to prepare candidates to meet standards for their fields. It provides adequate resources to develop and implement the unit's assessment plan. The unit has adequate information technology resources to support faculty and candidates. Faculty and candidates have access both to sufficient and current library and curricular resources and electronic information.
H(11)	Candidates and faculty have training in the access to current education-related technology.	<p><i>Standard 6: Unit Facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The facilities support faculty and candidate's use of information technologies in instruction.
H(12)	The unit has sufficient faculty and administrative, clerical, and technical staff to ensure the consistent delivery and quality of programs.	<p><i>Standard 5: Personnel</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unit provides an adequate number of support personnel so that programs can prepare candidates to meet standards. The unit provides adequate resources and opportunities for professional development of faculty, including training in the use of technology.
<p>Sources of evidence: Institutional Report Faculty vitae List of faculty assignments and loads over time (1-2 semesters) Advising loads and descriptions of how assigned Samples of faculty publications and other scholarly activities Faculty qualifications and development activities Faculty evaluations and professional development plans Recruitment plans (programs, investments, results) Faculty reports on best practice Syllabi – examples of instructional strategies Student work (reflection, problem-solving, etc.) List of faculty (full-time unit; full-time college/part-time unit; adjunct and part time)</p> <p>Interviews: Dean or chair of unit Unit faculty Principals and cooperating teachers Candidates President/ Vice President (CEO) Multicultural and Affirmative Action Office</p>		

The advantage of an electronic report is that most supporting documentation can be hyperlinked within the institutional report. Examples of such evidence can be found in the list below. In the event that you have exhibits that are not digitized, please include them in the exhibit room.

All exhibits must be categorized and referenced to the Board of Teaching (BOT) standards. All of the documents in the exhibit room should be clearly marked to correspond to the BOT standards, by code, (A1, A2, A3, B1, B2, B3, B4...). Exhibit room documents in file folders or binders should be labeled with the appropriate BOT standards. Also required is a list of all the exhibits, aligned to BOT standards, with an indication of where to find the evidence in the institutional report, the exhibit room, or other location (see sample in **Appendix G**)

SAMPLE SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTS that you may select to use:

- Institutional report
- Course syllabi for all professional education courses
- Catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies
 - Mission statement of the institution and unit
 - Policies on governance and operations of the unit
 - Description on the unit, including organizational charts
 - Minutes and membership of advisory, policy, and governing groups that impact on professional education
 - Fiscal records and budgets for the unit and comparable units
 - Long-range plans
 - Policies, practices, and budget/expenditures related to acquisitions for library, media resources, and technology
 - Due process policies and practices.
- Agenda, participants, and products of meetings, workshops, and/or training sessions related to curriculum
- Program evaluation summaries and actual documents (over time)
- Schedule of classes offered in professional education
- Samples of student work from initial teacher preparation and advanced programs
- Follow-up studies of graduates conducted since the last on-site review
- Unit and program evaluations conducted since the last on-site review
- Student teaching/field experience handbooks
- Faculty and student handbooks
- Policies related to field experiences, student teaching, and other clinical experiences
- Descriptions of pre-student teaching field and clinical experiences
- Written agreements with local schools for student teaching placement and collaborative projects
- Student teaching placement records (at least 2 years)
- Descriptions of sites for field-based experiences
- Policies and criteria for admission and retention

- Policies and/or descriptions of advising and monitoring procedures
- Transcripts for current candidates and recent graduates
- Candidate competencies expected by completion of programs
- Assessment plans and measures used to ensure that candidates are ready to enter the profession
- Summaries of performance assessments
- Faculty vitae that includes information on the following:
 1. Academic degrees
 2. Professional experiences including teaching in K-12 schools
 3. Teaching and administrative load for the past two semesters
 4. Current professional and academic association memberships
 5. Current professional assignments and activities
 6. Publications
 7. Papers presented
 8. Other scholarly activity
- Qualifications and selection procedures for cooperating teachers and college/university supervisors
- List of supervisors and assignments, it is helpful if this is in chart format with an indication of the supervisor's K-12 teaching experience noted for the team's review.
- Faculty handbook
- Policies for faculty evaluation and related instruments
- Faculty/staff directory
- Faculty loads for advising, teaching, and supervising
- Faculty identified as full time college, part-time unit full time college, adjunct and part-time
- Records of faculty involvement in associations, on campus committees, and other professional activities
- Samples of faculty publications
- Record of meetings, workshops, and/or training sessions for cooperating teachers

Don't forget a list of all the exhibits aligned to BOT standards, is required for team's use.

Sample BOT Interview Schedule

Sunday	Welcome Dinner/social time 5:30-7:00PM Location: Agenda: Social get together, Dinner, Highlights of Program			
	TEAM MEMBER 1	TEAM MEMBER 2	TEAM MEMBER 3	OTHER <i>(Team member 4 and/or Team chair)</i>
Monday	GOVERNANCE/RESOURCES FACULTY/ LIBRARY RESOURCES TECHNOLOGY/SUPPORT SERVICES 5G Qualifications, Composition, Assignments of Professional Education	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/IMPLEMENTATION CANDIDATE COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM 5A Professional and Pedagogical Studies; 5B General and Content Studies 5D Candidate Qualifications;	CLINICAL EXPERIENCES COLLABORATION with Partners STUDENT ADVISING 5C Clinical and Field Experiences;	

	Faculty; 5H Institutional Governance	5F Candidate Competence	5E Monitoring and Advising;	
???	Team pick up at hotel	Team pick up at hotel	Team pick up at hotel	
8:00AM	Team meeting in campus workroom	Team meeting in campus workroom	Team meeting in campus workroom	Meeting with BOT Chair and Unit Chair
8:30AM	Meeting with President	Unit Head/ Dept Chair Curr devel, evaluation, faculty cooperation, roles of committees, use of advisory body, criteria for program admission, program requirements, appeals process; Program standards: A 1,2 3, B1, 3, Monitoring and Advising: E 6, 7, G10, H6, E2- (ask for member 3) about the BOT statutory language about appeals—is it published? Candidate Qualifications: D1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Competence of Candidates: F1, 2, A1, F4	Director of Clinical Experiences C1, 2,3, 4, 5 G 5, 8 criteria for selection of co op teachers, selection of schools, evaluation of st tchrs, policies and procedures for st tchg, training of co op teachers	Meet with Administratio n along with Team member one
9:00AM		continue		
9:30AM	Dept of Educ Faculty – without Dean/chair (dev of curri, relationship to unit for decision making, advising load, work with adjuncts, resources, SEPS and Program standards, assessment, self study) 9:30- 10:00 questioning priority E7, G1, G2, G7, G9, G10, G11, G13	(Meet with Ed Faculty see column one) 10:00-10:30 questioning priority A1, 2, 3, B1, 3, E7, G10, H6, Advising Standards E1, 7		
10:00A M	continue	continue		
10:30A M	Unit Head/ Chair of Department (long range plan for unit, budget, decision making structure, faculty decisions, load, scholarship, prof devel) Faculty: G1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,7,8,9, 12,13 Counseling Services E7 Program A1 Governance: H1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,7,8,9,11,12	Current Students – shared time with member 3 A2, B3, E7,	Current Students (undergrad) With Team member Two G 9. H 6, H 10,11 E1, 7, 2 ask about awareness of appeals procedure	
11:00A M	continue	Curriculum Committee (Dept/Unit Level) curr development, system for ongoing deve and eval of lic programs, general studies, content studies expertise, monitoring progress Program Standards: A3, B2, B4, Monitoring and Advising: E3, E4, E5, Competence of Candidates: F1, F2, F4, A1		
11:30A				

M				
12:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	
12:30PM	Lunch meeting	Lunch meeting	Lunch meeting	
1:00PM	Finance and Operations VP (long range plan for unit, budget, decision making structure, faculty decisions, load,)	Assessment Committee: Program Standards: A3, B2, B4, Monitoring and Advising: E3, E4, E5, E6 Competence of Candidates: D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, F1, F2, F4, A1	Licensing Officer records, data base, criteria for recommendation, test data, transcripts, eval of prior work; (perhaps registrar also?) E3, 6, & D 5	
1:30PM				
2:00PM	Academic Affairs Committee (Institutional Level) Long range plans of institution, development of policy, tchg load, faculty development, allocation of resources, evalu process of programs and unit Governance H1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10,11,12 Faculty: G1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13			
2:30PM		Continue	continue	
3:00PM	Selected Arts & Sciences Faculty shared time G2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13	Selected Arts & Sciences Faculty shared time B1, 3, E7 G10 D3, D5,		
3:30PM	continue	continue	Current Student Teachers adequacy of prep; understanding of standards, faculty model instruction; how evaluated, placements, clinicals, G 9. H 6, H 10,11 E1, 2, 7	
4:00PM	Adjunct and Guest College/University Knowledge of program and standards; orientation, input level; “G” standards, especially: G2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	Current Students- Weekend undergraduates and graduates.		
4:30PM		Teacher Education Advisory Group Council H6, plus others	Cooperating Teachers and Administrators from partner schools C4, C5, G5 8, H 6, 10, 11	Alumni and recent graduates Graduates of MAE advanced Programs-
5:00 PM				Chairs meet with unit head

5:15	Team shuttled to hotel	Team shuttled to hotel	Team shuttled to hotel	

Tuesday	GOVERNANCE/RESOURCES FACULTY Qualifications, Composition, Assignments of Professional Education Faculty; Institutional Governance	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT/IMPLEMENTATION In Professional and Pedagogical Studies; In General and Content Studies	CANDIDATES In clinical and Field Experiences; Candidate Qualifications; Monitoring and Advising; Competencies of Candidates	OTHER
?	Team pick up at hotel	Team pick up at hotel	Team pick up at hotel	
8:00AM		Team writing time	Team writing time	Chairs meet with unit head
8:30AM	Diversity of faculty & students Plan for recruitment, effects, support(both faculty and students) G3	Follow up Assessment Process and System Meet with person who manages the data management system. What program data is maintained and utilized? How are candidates monitored through the program?	Partner School Visits Visits to Field Sites 1. Senior High or Junior High/Middle School 2. Elementary 3. Return to campus by 11:30- Noon At schools arrange for 3 meetings (20 min each): 1) interview with principal (or lead contact person) 2) interview with co-op teachers who have had st tchers in last 3 years present student teachers or practicum students continue	Team member 4: Career ,Psychological, and Social Counseling E7
9:00AM			continue	
9:30AM	Library Resources H11 H10		During transit ask about these standards as appropriate:	

			C1, 2,3, 4, 5 G 5, 8 criteria for selection of co op teachers, selection of schools, evaluation of student teachers, policies and procedures for student teacher, training of co op teachers	
10:00A M	Institutional Technology H11, H10	Follow up with unit chair regarding any assessment or program standards	continue	
10:30A M				
11:00A M			Continue	
11:30A M			Return from school visit to campus work room by noon	
12:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	
12:30P M	Team conference & writing time	Team conference & writing time	Team conference & writing time	
1:00PM				
1:30PM				
2:00PM				
2:30PM				
3:00PM				
3:30PM				
4:15PM				
4:30PM				
5:00PM				
Wednes -day,	9:30 AM Oral Exit Report			

APPENDIX F

<i>Status of State Submission for National SPA Recognition</i>		
Program	Prof Organization	Approved
Elementary	Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI)	X
Early Childhood	National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)	X
Physical Education	National Association of Sport and Physical Education (AAHPERD/NASPE)	X
Mathematics grades 5-8	National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)	X
Mathematics grades 9-12	National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)	X
Teaching English as a Second Language	Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	X

MINNESOTA BOARD OF TEACHING

**GENERAL OPERATING PROCEDURES
FOR
SELECTION, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION OF TEAM MEMBERS**

[SELECTION OF TEAM MEMBERS] *The evaluation team may include representatives from teacher preparing institutions, licensed practicing teachers, interested citizens, and state education agencies. The administrator of the defined administrative and instructional unit of the institution and the Board of Teaching staff shall negotiate team membership from a slate of possible evaluators provided by the Board of Teaching staff...*(Minnesota Rules, Part 87007600, Approved of Minnesota Institutions to Prepare Persons for Teacher Licensure, subpart6).

For each institution, a slate of potential team members is compiled by Board of Teaching staff from a pool of pre-identified individuals. Nominations of candidates to serve on evaluation teams are elicited from:

- deans/chairs of Minnesota teacher preparation institutions
- presidents of Minnesota professional teacher organizations
- previous Board of Teaching team members

Nominating individuals and/or organizations are asked to consider representation as follows:

Public School Personnel:
Years of Experience (5+)
Urban, Suburban, Rural Districts
Grades K-6; Grades 5-12, K-12 (subject areas)
Racial/Ethnic diversity
Teachers/Administrators/other instructional personnel

Post-Secondary Institutions:
Years of Experience (5+)
Private/Public Institutions
Racial/Ethnic diversity
Faculty/Dens/Chairs/other

Board of teaching evaluation teams consist of five-six members and include licensed practicing teachers and administrators and college/university personnel.

Board of Teaching staff compiles a slate of individuals for the institution's consideration. Upon confirmation from the institution of the proposed slate, staff selects the team.

In addition to selecting an evaluation team which is as broadly representative as possible of the education profession, the professional and education backgrounds of team members are reviewed to assure that membership does not present a conflict of interest (i.e. individuals should not be a graduate of the institution, individuals may not be attending or have family attending the institution, individuals may not be teaching or have held positions at the institution, individuals may not be currently serving the institution in consulting arrangements, etc.)

MINNESOTA BOARD OF TEACHING

GENERAL OPERING PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION OF TEAM MEMBERS (continued)

[TRAINING OF TEAM MEMBERS]

Training of team members is delivered by Board of Teaching staff. A four hour training session is held on the Sunday afternoon/evening of the on-site visit. Training consists of:

- Team Orientation
- Overview of Institutional Approval Activities
- Charge to team members
- Roles of team members
- Responsibilities of team members
- Data Collection Techniques
- Writing Final Report
- Preparation for On-site Activity – Schedule of Activities

[EVALUATION OF TEAM MEMBERS]

The Board of Teaching team chair, who is a Board of Teaching staff member, is responsible for providing assurance to the institution and the Board of Teaching that the team accomplishes its responsibilities.

From observations and feedback from the institution, the chair determines the degree to which each team member:

- Demonstrated professional expertise in working with individuals representing the institution and with team members
- Analyzed information and demonstrated its relationship to established standards
- Performed with accuracy and completeness in writing individual reports

NOTE: These operating guidelines for team member selection, training, and evaluation have been in effect since 1979, when rules for institutional approval were first adopted by the Board of Teaching.

GENERAL OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR TRANSMITTING THE FINAL ACTION REPORT REGARDING APPROVAL STATUS

MINNESOTA RULES, PART 8700.7600 APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA INSTITUTIONS TO PREPARE PERSONS FOR TEACHER LICENSURE

Subp. 7. Written evaluation report

The written report of findings and the recommendation of the evaluators shall be forwarded to the institution and to the Board of Teaching....Based upon the written report prepared by the institution, and the written report of findings and the recommendation of the evaluators, the Board of Teaching shall (take appropriate approval action).

Operational Procedures:

[Final Action Report] After the Board of Teaching has taken action, a letter and the written report of the evaluators is forwarded to the president of the institution and to the administrator of the defined administrative and instructional unit of the institution informing them of Board of Teaching action regarding approval status.

Note: This operational procedure for transmitting the final action report of the Board of Teaching to the institution has been in effect since 1979, when rules for institutional approval were first adopted by the Board of Teaching.

APPENDIX H

EXAMPLE of Electronic Index of Supportive Documents/Exhibits

(Note: you may also need another column in the chart indicating hardcopy documents that are only in the exhibit room.)

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE		
<i>A (1)</i>	<i>LINKS to documents within IR</i>	<i>LINKS ON WEBSITE only</i>
The institution has high quality professional education programs that are cohesive, comprehensive, and based on research, theory, and accepted practice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▫ Dispositions▫ Conceptual Framework Bibliography▫ Knowledge Base Bibliography	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▫
<i>A(2)</i>		
The institution requires that candidates in teacher preparation programs complete a professional education sequence of courses based on the components under part 8710.2000.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▫ Program Matrices▫ Syllabi▫ Advisement Checklists▫ Course Descriptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▫ Graduate Studies Website

<i>B(4) Board of Teaching</i>		
Teacher candidates can integrate general, content, professional, and pedagogical studies, as measured by teacher performance, and performance of the students they teach.	Integrated Units Graduate Syllabi Field Exp/Student Teaching Eval. Forms-Portfolio Guidelines	
<i>C(1)</i>		
The teacher licensure programs incorporate a broad range of ongoing clinical and field experiences that provide candidates opportunities to demonstrate the required skills and knowledge under part 8710.2000.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ EDU 1500 Field Trip 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫
<i>C(2)</i>		
Candidates have experiences with diverse populations, students with disabilities, and students of different ages under the direction of teacher education faculty in collaboration with school partners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Field Experience Surveys ▫ Placements ▫ Demographics of School Sites ▫ Education Student Handbook: Field Experiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫